REMARKS

General

This amendment is now in double spaced according to 37CFR S1.52(b)92.

Drawings

According to Applicant's records, a new set of drawings to overcome Examiner's objections was enclosed in the 08/18/2004 reply and are therefore not enclosed herein.

Description

A small amendment to the description was made to clarify a point which helps in drafting a claim. The amendment does not add any new matter it simply better describes a structure fully supported by the drawings.

Claims

Although Zanavich does appear to have some remote semblance to this instant invention, Applicant wonders whether it would have been obvious to someone in the art of growing plants to use a technology definitely aimed at building fences, a nonanalogous art. Moreover, several modifications would be necessary in order to use this or any of the other referenced prior art. Moreover, Zanavich only shows rails with end members entering partially into posts while figure 5 of this instant invention, more particularly, shows stakes passing through connector sections, something which cannot be done with the teachings of Zanavich. Another element that Zanavich does not appear to teach are perpendicularly set receiving holes so that the fence can turn a corner. Zanavich's fence appears to be a linear fence whereas this instant invention teaches perpendicularly set holes to achieve substantially

A:17038729306

square structures such as in figs 6-7. Applicant agrees that one may consider it to be "obvious" to use Zanavich teachings to make fence posts that turn corners but one should be careful in making unsuggested modifications in any of the prior art. Because of these differences, Applicant contends that the rejections under 102 and 103 are moot. Applicant has rewritten the claims mostly in view of rejections under 112 while trying to limit the claims so that they further distinguish over the prior art.

Applicant hopes that he has responded to the Office Action in an appropriate manner.

Requests For Constructive Assistance

The undersigned has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they define unobvious structure because it produces new and unexpected results. If for any reasons the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very Respectfully,

August Puspurs

Applicant pro se